

WATER QUALITY M E M O R A N D U M

Utah Coal Regulatory Program

May 9, 2005

TO: Internal File

THRU: D. Wayne Hedberg, Permit Supervisor

FROM: David Darby, Senior Reclamation Specialist

RE: 2004 2nd Quarter Water Monitoring, Sunnyside Cogeneration Associates (SCA),
Star Point Waste Fuel Company, C/007/0042-WQ04-2, Task ID #2014

1. Was data submitted for all required monitoring sites? YES ☒ NO ☐

SCA is currently mining the coal refuse piles accumulated from the Star Pint Mine. The Star Point Mine is currently closed and reclaimed. SCA mining operation consists of removing refuse material and hauling it for use at the SCA power cogeneration plant at Sunnyside, Utah.

Information for this report was evaluated from file 0:\007042.swf\Water Quality\Datacheck2004format.xls. SCA only monitors effluents from sedimentation ponds on the site. There are no perennial streams, lakes springs or seeps in the immediate vicinity that can be influenced directly by mining activities. Three sedimentation ponds are located in the permit area and shown Maps 731.720a and 731.720b. The parameters to be monitored are specified in the UPDES Permit UTG040025, see Section 742.221d of the MRP.

Springs No spring to monitor

Streams All streams are ephemeral.

Wells No wells to monitor.

UPDES There are three active discharge sites at the Star Point Waste Fuel site, Sedimentation Ponds 5, 6 and 9. Discharges from the permit area are located near Sage Brush Canyon. The locations of the three sedimentation ponds are shown on Map 731.720a of the MRP.

The operator monitored and submitted 2nd quarter UPDES information for April, May and June.

2. Were all required parameters reported for each site? YES ☒ NO ☐

Springs

Not required.

Streams

Not required.

UPDES

The Permittee is required to monitor for Flow (gpm), pH (6.5 to 9.0mmhos), Oil and Grease (mg/L), No visible sheen, Total Suspended Solids (mg/L), Total Iron (mg/L) and Total Dissolved Solids (lbs/day). There was flow reported at sites 005 of 5 gpm and 006 of 30 gpm, however there was no other monitoring data submitted characterizing the chemical or physical appearance of effluent.

3. Were any irregularities found in the data? YES ☐ NO ☒

4. On what date does the MRP require a five-year resampling of baseline water data

Does not specify

5. Based on your review, what further actions, if any, do you recommend?

Does the Mine Operator need to submit more information to full fill this quarter's monitoring requirements? ___ Yes ___ X No

A copy of the data file will be e-mailed to the Mine Operator and DOGM Mine Inspector.

6. Follow-up from last quarter, if necessary.

Did the Mine Operator submit all the missing and/or irregular data (datum)?

The review of this report and the previous report were delayed. The data will be tracked to ensure and the database is updated.